

**Draft Summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
July 31, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group on July 31, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip Chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

The facilitator reviewed progress made by the Engineering and Operations Work Group in preparing draft Issue Sheets. She reminded participants that they worked on resource goals and geographic scope for their Issue Sheets at their last meeting. She added that the Engineering and Operations Task Force has developed language for the draft existing information, information needs and level of analysis categories for review and comment at today's meeting.

- Stuart Edell mentioned that Butte County had submitted comments to the Plenary Group, including suggested new Issue Statements, on Draft Scoping Document 1. He asked if those Issue Statements would come back to the individual Work Groups for Issue Sheet development. Wayne Dyok of the consulting team responded that the Plenary Group tasked DWR and the consulting team to contact individuals providing comments on SD1 to prepare draft language for potential inclusion in the document. The Plenary Group will review revised SD1, and if the Plenary Group accepts a new Issue Statement, it would be passed back to the appropriate Work Group for Issue Sheet development.
- Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors inquired about an issue he submitted to the Engineering and Operations Work Group that appears to have been missed during Issue Sheet development. The Facilitator responded that the issue had been included in Issue Sheet E10.

### **Action Items – June 25, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the June 25, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Action Item #EO18</b> | Prepare a simple graphic showing the relationship between power and water costs in the north vs. south part of the state.     |
| Status:                  | Work on developing the graphic is continuing and should be ready by the August Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. |

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Item #EO19</b> | Revise Issue Sheets for distribution to the Engineering and Operations Work Group.   |
| Status:                  | Revised Issue Sheets were distributed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group prior to the meeting. The Facilitator reported that since distributing the Sheets, additional DWR operational information was received from Dave Ferguson so revised Issue Sheets were distributed to the participants at this meeting. The |

operational information provided by Dave is appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

### **Review and Revise Issue Sheets**

The Engineering and Operations Work Group reviewed revised draft Issue Sheets developed by the Task Force including comments made by the participants at last month's Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The Facilitator reminded the Engineering and Operations Work Group that the Issue Sheets are working documents to assist in the preparation of Study Plans. She added that comments on Issue Statements should be directed to the Plenary Group as part of the review of Draft SD1.

In response to a request from the Environmental Work Group for better coordination with the Engineering and Operations Work Group, participants received a draft proposal for allocating and coordinating issues between the two Work Groups. Ralph Torres described the criteria by which issues were allocated to the two Work Groups and the process by which the Work Groups will coordinate their activities to address these issues. Improved coordination is needed since it is likely that Engineering and Operations Work Group activities will include responding to information provided by the Environmental Work Group. Ralph asked participants to review the draft proposal and provide any comments or suggested revisions to him. The draft proposal for Allocating and Coordinating Issues between the Environmental Work Group and the Engineering and Operations Work Group is appended to this summary as Attachment 5.

The Engineering and Operations Work Group reviewed, revised and completed Issue Sheets E1 through E15. The Issue Sheets, with revisions from this meeting, are appended to this summary as Attachment 6. The following paragraphs summarize additional comments or discussions beyond revisions reflected in Attachment 6.

#### **E1**

One participant asked if DWR could investigate innovative, non-traditional power generating methods (in-stream power generation). Ralph Torres responded that DWR was looking into these issues presently, including all options to increase power generation potential at both the Forebay and Hyatt facilities.

#### **E2**

Tres Hobbie requested a Resource Goal be added to operate the facility for the benefit of summertime lake-based recreation. Wayne Dyok responded that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group would be evaluating the impacts to recreation-based economies due to fluctuating lake levels. He added that E3 and E4 also address this issue. Tres asked that 'adequate' be replaced by 'maintain or enhance', in each Resource Goal when referring to recreation. Bill Lewis asked that the same global replacement be made for resource goals discussing flood management.

Dan Peterson from DWR asked if there was some penalty for not addressing a Resource Goal. Wayne Dyok responded there is no penalty for failing to address a specific resource goal but participants' goals will be considered when developing Study Plans.

#### **E3**

The Task Force determined E3 does not require additional study. DWR staff confirmed that the information identified on E3 is updated on a regular basis and the Issue Statement describes a management technique that may be included in a settlement agreement.

#### **E4**

Craig Jones from the State Water Contractors commented that E4 appears to be less focused than the other Issue Sheets. He added that there did not appear to be a direct connection between the question asked in the Issue Statement and the information included on the Issue Sheet. He was unclear how the Issue Sheet would generate a Study Plan that satisfied the Issue Statement. Wayne Dyok responded that E4 relates closely to issues from other Work Groups, for example modeling different lake levels and their impacts on recreation.

One participant asked why evaluation of different flow regimes has been removed from the Issue Statement since flow regimes are one of the main effects of facilities operation. If you remove flow regimes you run the risk of broadening the level of analysis. Ralph Torres responded that the Task Force saw the systems models as a tool and thought they should be removed from the Issue Statement. Wayne Dyok suggested system tools and flow regimes be left in the Issue Statement to help focus the level of analysis. He added that developing a flow chart showing how the system models, temperature, and flow work together would be useful.

#### **E11**

Dave Ferguson reported that the public safety issues in E11 (stakes holding down tires) has been resolved and therefore did not require additional study. DWR staff agreed to prepare a white paper detailing the status of the stake removal program. DWR is currently exploring tire removal and disposal and will report back to the Engineering and Operations Work Group.

#### **E12, E13, E14**

The Engineering and Operations Work Group will be providing technical support (modeling, operations analysis, etc.) in response to data provided by the Environmental Work Group.

#### **Next Steps**

The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed to form a Task Force to develop draft Study Plans based on the Issue Sheets completed at this meeting. The Task Force will develop a Study Plan outline and consolidate information needs from separate Issue Sheets when necessary to avoid study overlap. A flow chart depicting the interrelations of all Issue Sheets will be prepared for the Engineering and Operations Work Group. The Task Force will report back to the Engineering and Operations Work Group at their next meeting. Wayne Dyok added that the Task Forces activities would be coordinated with DWR and the consulting team efforts to develop a template for Study Plans that would be utilized by all the Work Groups.

One participant asked if the Comprehensive Study Group activities could be integrated into the Engineering and Operations Work Group activities. Ralph Torres agreed to contact the group and ask if they might be interested in giving a presentation to explain their activities to the Engineering and Operations Work Group at some future date.

Ron Davis requested that his issues regarding fish straying and economic contributions of fish be transferred to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for their consideration. The Facilitator agreed to forward the issues to the appropriate RAM.

The Facilitator agreed to prepare final Issue Sheets, accepting all changes agreed upon during this meeting plus showing additional paragraphs currently being prepared by DWR staff. The revised, completed Issue Sheets will be distributed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group prior to their next meeting.

Ralph Torres thanked all Work Group and Task Force participants for their efforts in preparing the Issue Sheets.

### **Next Meeting**

The Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2001

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Location: Oroville Field Division

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed to form a Task Force to prepare draft Study Plans based on Issue Sheets.
2. The Work Group agreed to meet again on August 29, 2001 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Oroville Field Division.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Engineering and Operations Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #EO20:** Revise Issue Sheets and replace 'adequate' with 'maintain or enhance' on all recreation facilities and flood management Resource Goals. Distribute completed Issue Sheets to Engineering and Operations Work Group.

**Responsible:** Facilitator

**Due Date:** August 29, 2001

**Action Item #EO21:** Prepare a flow chart for the Engineering and Operations Work Group depicting interrelations of all Issue Sheets.

**Responsible:** DWR staff

**Due Date:** August 29, 2001

**Action Item #EO22:** Prepare a strategy for modeling coordination with Recreation & Socioeconomics Work Group for Economic and Environmental issues.

**Responsible:** Consulting Team

**Due Date:** August 29, 2001

**Action Item #EO23:** Consider developing an appropriate 'bin' strategy for issue statements that don't generate studies

**Responsible:** Consulting Team/RAMS

**Due Date:** TBD

**Action Item #EO24:** Transfer Ron Davis' concerns regarding fish straying and economic contributions of fish to Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group

**Responsible:** Facilitator

**Due Date:** Before August Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting

**Action Item #EO25:** Check with Comprehensive Study Group for possible presentation to Engineering and Operations Work Group

**Responsible:** DWR

**Due Date:** TBD

**Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting Agenda  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
July 31, 2001**

**Agenda**

Desired Outcomes

- *Update on Action Items*
- *Review of Task Force Revisions and Continue Development of Issue Sheets*
- *Next Steps*

- 1. Welcome, Introductions**
- 2. June 25, 2001 Meeting Summary and Action Items**
- 3. Review and Revise Issue Sheets**
- 4. Action Items and Next Steps**

**Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting Attendees  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Art Hinojosa   | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Bill Lewis     | Yuba City                                       |
| Bill Smith     | Harza/EDAW Team                                 |
| Byron Stone    | Department of Fish and Game                     |
| Craig Jones    | State Water Contractors                         |
| Dan Peterson   | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Dave Ferguson  | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Doak Cotter    | Butte County Water Diverters                    |
| Don Marquez    | Kern County Water Association                   |
| Ed Craddock    | Butte County                                    |
| Frank Caunt    | Butte County Water Commission                   |
| Kathy Petersen | OWID  |
| Laurine White  | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers                    |
| Lori Brown     | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Mary Keller    | Sutter County                                   |
| Rashid Ahmad   | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Ralph Svetich  | Department of Water Resources, Flood Management |
| Ralph Torres   | Department of Water Resources                   |
| Ron Davis      | Resident  |
| Stuart Edell   | Butte County                                    |
| Tres Hobbie    | CEFER   |
| Wayne Dyok     | Harza/EDAW                                      |

## **Notes from Flip Charts Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

The following list was recorded on flip charts during the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting. The flip chart listing is not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting or to indicate agreement or disagreement with the items listed; the intent is to provide a summary for informational purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

### **Action Items**

- Global change on recreation facilities Resource Goals – Delete ‘adequate’ change as per E2 (2 bullets)
- Global change on ‘adequate flood protection’
- Flow Chart depicting interrelations of all Issue Sheets
- Modeling Coordination with Recreation & Socioeconomics Work Group for Economics and Environmental
- Consider appropriate ‘bin’ for Issues Statements that don’t generate studies – Wayne contact Tom Wegge for Economics Data
- Give Ron Davis’ concerns regarding fish straying and economic contributions of fish to Recreation & Socioeconomics Work Group
- Ralph Torres check with Comprehensive Study group for possible presentation

### **Study Plan Approach**

#### Task Force

- Lori Brown to send e-mail to E & O Work Group for Task Force participation
- Other participants
  - Ed Craddock
  - Don Marquez (C. Jones)
  - Rashid Ahmed
  - Other DWR staff
  - Ken Kules

### **Yuba County Water Agency**

Yuba-Feather Flood Protection

Program NOP - EIR

Scoping comments to:

Curt Aikens

YCWA

email - [YCWA@YCWA.com](mailto:YCWA@YCWA.com)

By August 23

Scoping Meetings - 7-9pm

Aug 15 - Yuba County Courthouse

Aug 16 - Oro Sports Club

**Operational Information List for Issue Sheets  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**



**Allocating and Coordinating Issues between the Environmental Work Group  
and the Engineering and Operations Work Group  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**Revised Issue Sheets – July 31, 2001  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**